

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/788,606	02/27/2004	Mary E. Brunkow	601117-109	9642	
22504 7	7590 09/21/2006		EXAMINER		
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP 2600 CENTURY SQUARE			XIE, XIAOZHEN		
2600 CENTUR 1501 FOURTH	•		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
SEATTLE, W	'A 98101-1688		1646		
			DATE MAILED: 09/21/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/788,606	BRUNKOW ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Xiaozhen Xie	1646		

	Xiaozhen Xie	1646	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 August 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ul>			the issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, , ,		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al</li></ul>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected to.  Claim(s) rejected: <u>88-96</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>77-10.0</u>			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:	(1)		
	GARY B. NICKOL, PH.D.		
	OUR DUICORY PATENT EXAMINE	R	
	TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claims 88-96 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement and requirement, is maintained for reasons of record in the previous office actions. Applicant argues that the amended claim 88 reciting that the second polynucleotide comprises a nucleotide sequence that is fully complementary to SEQ ID NO: 1, 5, 9, 11, 13 or 15. Applicant argues that enablement in the present case is met by the provision of the starting polynucleotide sequences and methods of hybriziding other sequences and exporessing the TGF-b binding protein, and one of skill would not require to make every single possible embodiment. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but have not been found to be persuasive. The the claims still read on a genus, i.e. an isolated antibody or antigen binding fragment thereof which binds to a TGF-beta binding protein, or fragments, variants thereof. While the specification discloses an isolated antibody or antigen binding fragment thereof which specifically binds to a TGF-beta binding protein encoded by a polynucleotide that comprises SEQ ID Nos:1, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15, one of skill has to evaluate any non-exemplified antibody for binding specificity.

The rejection of claims 88-96 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, is maintained for reasons of record in the previous office action. Applicant argues that the class of polynucleotides encoding TGF-b binding protien can be easily determined based on provision of SEQ ID NO: 1, 5, 9, 11, 13 or 15, and applicant needs not disclose the chemical structures that would add "unnecessary bulk" to the application. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but have not been found to be persuasive. Without the teachings that define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others, one skilled in the art cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what property the protein has, rather than what it is.

The rejection of claims 88-96 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-8 of U. S. Patent No: 6,803,453, is maintained. It is noted that Applicant indicated that a terminal disclaimer will be filed upon indication of allowable subject matter in this application.